

ALABAMA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

COUNTY OF Kulton
STATE OF Georgia

BEFORE ME, the undersigned authority, duly commissioned and qualified in and for the State and County aforesaid, personally came and appeared AL HEARTLEY, who being by me first duly sworn deposed and said that he/she is appearing as a witness on behalf of BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. before the Alabama Public Service Commission in Docket No. 29054, IN RE: Implementation of the Federal Communications Commission's Triennial Review Order (Phase II - Local Switching for Mass Market Customers), and if present before the Commission and duly sworn, his/her statements would be set forth in the annexed Rebuttal testimony consisting of 6 pages and 0 exhibits.

Alfred A. Heartley

SWORN TO AND SUBSCRIBED BEFORE ME

THIS 3rd DAY OF MARCH, 2004

Micheale F. Bixler Notary Public

MICHEALE F. BIXLER
Notary Public, Douglas County, Georgia
My Commission Expires November 3, 2005

BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC.
REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF ALFRED A. HEARTLEY
BEFORE THE ALABAMA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
DOCKET NO. 29054 PHASE II
MARCH 5, 2004

Q. PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, YOUR BUSINESS ADDRESS, AND YOUR
POSITION WITH BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS, INC. ("BELLSOUTH").

A. My name is Alfred A. Heartley. My business address is 754
Peachtree Street, Atlanta, Georgia 30308. My title is General
Manager - Wholesale Performance and Regional Centers for
BellSouth.

Q. ARE YOU THE SAME ALFRED HEARTLEY WHO EARLIER FILED DIRECT
TESTIMONY IN THIS DOCKET?

A. Yes.

Q. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY BEING FILED
TODAY?

A. I will respond to portions of the direct testimonies of Mr.
James D. Webber on behalf of MCI and Mr. Mark David Van de Water
on behalf of AT&T regarding the batch hot cut process.

1 Q. ALL PARTIES HAVE DIRECTED THIS COMMISSION TO VARIOUS
2 PORTIONS OF THE TRO AND THE RULES IN SUPPORT OF THEIR POSITIONS
3 IN THEIR DIRECT TESTIMONY. WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF THE D.C.
4 CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ORDER ON THE TRO IN THIS PROCEEDING?

5
6 A. Currently the impact of the DC Circuit Court's opinion is
7 unclear. At the time of filing this testimony, the DC Court had
8 vacated large portions of the rules promulgated as a result of
9 the TRO, but stayed the effective date of the opinion for at
10 least sixty days. Therefore my understanding is that the TRO
11 remains intact for now, but its content, and the rules adopted
12 thereto, must be suspect in light of the court's harsh
13 condemnation of large portions of the order. Accordingly, we
14 will reserve judgment, and the right to supplement our testimony
15 as circumstances dictate, with regard to the ultimate impact of
16 the DC Court's order on this case.

17
18 Q. ON PAGE 17, MR. WEBBER DESCRIBES WHAT HE CALLS "THE
19 POTENTIALLY CHAOTIC SITUATION" THAT COULD RESULT WHEN MULTIPLE
20 TECHNICIANS WORK ON THE MDF. IS HIS SPECULATION CREDIBLE?

21
22 A. No. Mr. Weber's speculation about a "potentially chaotic
23 situation" ignores that BellSouth will manage the conversions.
24 As part of this management process, BellSouth has determined the
25 number of technicians that can work simultaneously on a frame.
26 While too many technicians working in a tight location can be

1 cumbersome, our technicians are trained to work efficiently and
2 safely together. In addition, BellSouth intends to schedule the
3 appropriate number of technicians on different shifts. This may
4 require 24 hour scheduling but BellSouth is willing to do such
5 scheduling. BellSouth will not permit a "chaotic situation" to
6 occur, as Mr. Webber speculates.

7
8 Q DO YOU AGREE WITH THE EXTRAPOLATION OF WORK TIMES MR. VAN
9 DE WATER DOES ON PAGE 35-36 OF HIS TESTIMONY?

10
11 A. No. Although Mr. Van de Water's analysis of the time
12 required to cutover a UNE-P to a UNE-L does not differ
13 substantially from BellSouth's, his conclusion that such work
14 times will preclude BellSouth from handling anticipated volumes
15 is incorrect.

16
17 Beginning on page 35, at line 20, Mr. Van de Water uses
18 BellSouth data to argue that any given technician could complete
19 12-13 UNE-P conversions per day (using a 7 hour day).
20 BellSouth's force model is more conservative, yielding an
21 average of 10 conversions per shift (using a 7.5 hour day).
22 Even taking BellSouth's more conservative view and assuming a
23 "worst case" scenario, BellSouth will still complete all of the
24 required conversions within 21 months. BellSouth's analysis
25 takes into consideration the different times required to
26 complete a conversion depending on the type of service requested

(SL1 or SL2) and the type conversion requested for SL1 orders
(Coordinated or Non-Coordinated).

Beginning on page 36, Mr. Van de Water uses BellSouth data in an attempt to prove that there is insufficient space on the MDF in the West Hollywood, FL C.O. for enough technicians to work simultaneously to complete enough conversions to create "meaningful" UNE competition. Again, while our analysis does not differ substantially, the conclusion that Mr. Van de Water draws is incorrect. Mr. Van de Water alleges that completing 104 hot cuts per day cannot support competition. Notably, he does not put forth a number of cuts that would, in his view, support competition. Moreover, BellSouth's "worst-case" force model assumes that only 126 cuts per day are required in West Hollywood to handle the UNE-P to UNE-L migration as well as normal growth within the 21-month timeframe. Based on the information provided above, 126 cuts per day would require approximately 12 technicians to complete. Eight technicians can work on the West Hollywood frame simultaneously without impacting productivity. Assuming this work is done during the 2 available night shifts to avoid interfering with any other activities, West Hollywood can accommodate up to 16 technicians per day. Therefore, BellSouth can work the required load in West Hollywood, Birmingham Main, and every other wire center in the BellSouth region.

1 Q. HOW DO UNMANNED CENTRAL OFFICES AFFECT BELLSOUTH'S
2 ABILITY TO HANDLE ANTICIPATED VOLUMES OF UNE-L ORDERS? (VAN DE
3 WATER, AT 38)?
4

5 A. Mr. Van de Water's statements beginning on page 38, that
6 unmanned Central Offices and hot cuts involving IDLC will limit
7 BellSouth's capacity to work Hot Cuts in Alabama are incorrect.
8 It is true that BellSouth employees do not report to work daily
9 at every Central Office. For those offices with a low volume of
10 work, technicians are dispatched as needed to work the pending
11 load, daily if required. However, while not all offices are
12 manned daily at the beginning of the workday, all BellSouth
13 Central Offices are manned if work is required. Our force model
14 includes hours for working conversions at all BellSouth wire
15 centers. Thus, BellSouth already has taken into account any so-
16 called "unmanned" offices.
17

18 Q. MR. VAN DE WATER DISCUSSES THE IMPACT OF IDLC DISPATCHES ON
19 HIS LOAD PRODUCTIONS AT PAGES 38-39 OF HIS TESTIMONY. DID
20 BELLSOUTH FACTOR THOSE DISPATCHES INTO ITS LOAD PROJECTION?
21

22 A. Yes. BellSouth's "worst-case" force model accounts
23 conservatively for dispatching outside technicians to handle
24 conversions involving IDLC. Unlike Mr. Van de Water's analysis,
25 BellSouth's force model bases the number of field dispatches
26 required on the %IDLC in every wire center. The force model

1 assumes that every conversion involving IDLC will require a
2 separate dispatch. In reality a technician would be dispatched
3 to work all of the conversions at a single interface at one
4 time. The assumption is therefore conservative as it is unknown
5 how many conversions will be required at each field interface
6 each day. Based on regional estimates of 4,827 daily outside
7 dispatches, well over 2.2M dispatches could be required to
8 complete the conversions and handle growth. BellSouth took
9 those dispatches into account in its force model.

10

11 Q. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR REBUTTAL TESTIMONY?

12

13 A. Yes.

14